

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/690,400	LUBISCH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Emily Bernhardt	1624	

**All Participants:**

(1) Emily Bernhardt.

(2) Mr. Martin Katz.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 21 May 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*See Continuation Sheet*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*E Bernhardt*  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of claims discussed: From applicants' response it appears that nonelected claims are intended to be cancelled. Mr. Katz concurred and said that applicants are preserving their right to file a division to pursue the nonelected subject matter. Accordingly, the method claims will be cancelled via an Examiner's Amendment. The examiner pointed to a sheet of data provided in the response which appears to be extraneous and not formally entered. It was agreed to ignore the page. .